

UNITY

AND THE UNIVERSITY.

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

VOLUME XVII.]

CHICAGO, JULY 10, 1886.

[NUMBER 19.]

CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER.

EDITORIALS—

NOTES: Some Recent English Tracts; Moral Atheism; <i>The Century</i> on Church Union; a Word of Self-exculpation; "Liberty Gone Wild"; Another Case of Mental Confusion; a Financial Point of View; a Premature Announcement; Two Practical Men; "Illustrations of Unitarianism"; a Passing Cloud; <i>The Independent's</i> New Contributor; Involuntary Co-workers; Signs of a Presbyterian Tendency; Queries; Logic <i>versus</i> Facts.....	271
How to Do It.....	272
How They Captured the Western Conference.—W. C. G....	274

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES—

To Memory.—EDWARD LIPPITT FALES.....	276
A Popular Fallacy.—J. C. F. GRUMBINE.....	276
The Life of My Soul. III.—A. W.....	277
THE STUDY TABLE.....	277
NOTES FROM THE FIELD.....	278
ANNOUNCEMENTS.....	279

OUR friend John Page Hopps, editor of the *Truth Seeker*, Leicester, England, is an indefatigable tract maker. A bundle of his latest has come to hand. One treats of "The Development of Freedom in the Established Church", another of "Cremation and Some Reasons for Preferring it to Burial", the third of "Plain Questions to Unprejudiced Thinkers"; all of which are excellent reading on this side of the water and would make good tools for our Post-office Mission. In the first mentioned, Mr. Hopps says: "I know leading church wardens who no more believe in the creeds of the church than I do. I know leading churchmen who do not know what the creeds of the church are as well as I do. The very best Unitarian book of our day, the one containing the most modern and most conclusive arguments against the deity of Jesus, is one written in reply to Canon Liddon by a beneficed clergyman of the established church."

THE appearance of the *Political Science Quarterly*, edited by the faculty of Columbia college, and published by Ginn & Co., Boston, a portly publication of 200 pages, is a significant sign of the times. It shows what this age is thinking about and what questions lie nearest the heart of the best people of this generation. Perhaps the most absorbing article in the June number is that by Dr. E. R. A. Seligman on the "Christian Socialists", in which the work of Robert Dale Owen, Maurice Kingsley and others is graphically and sympathetically considered, to which is added a valuable bibliography on the subject. How low and trifling are the problems of Christian *theology* compared with the problems of Christian *philanthropy*! How much more attractive does the word "Christian" appear when we think of it in relation to life and feeling rather than in relation to doctrine. Of course there is a connection between the one and the other, but the vitality of that connection appears only when the latter is subordinated to the former, considered as a means and not as an end. The

only test of the means is the result. By their fruit ye shall know them. Kingsley was anticipating the higher life and the nobler thought of the Christendom of the twentieth century when he wrote in connection with this thought, "Whatever doubt or doctrinal atheism you and your friends may have, don't fall into moral atheism. Don't forget the eternal goodness, whatever name you call it. I call it God." That is moral atheism that sets ethics *over against* religion and assumes antagonistic bases to these inseparable phases of the higher life. When we begin to talk of "mere morality", we merit again the withering indignation of Emerson when he paraphrased the contemptible phrase with, "Poor God, and nobody to help him."

THE discussion going on in the *Century* on the subject of church union enlists opposing thought of common excellence. It might be supposed that the matter could be easily summed up. If union is taken in the spirit, it must be noble. If it demands the sacrifice of principle, it supposes degradation. If it can bring men nearer to soul without wiping out natural and desirable differences of theory, its work could not but be priceless, so great would be its proportions. This might all be manifest. Men must not hate. The modern world will not have it. All things must come through love, by which the heavens were made.

H. L. T.

THE publishers of UNITY feel that they owe its readers a word of explanation in view of the absurd position in which we have been placed by the continuance of our name on the title-page of the *Unitarian*. Our connection with that magazine was terminated in May, on purely business considerations, and we acceded to the request of its editors that they be allowed to keep our name on the June number. This we did, not knowing that the magazine was about to leave its non-controversial attitude and make open war on UNITY and the Western Unitarian Conference. Our permission to keep our name on the title-page of the July number was not asked and would not have been granted.

C. H. K.

MR. BROOKE HERFORD is button-holed in a long editorial below. The "one word more" comes here. For he has a second article addressed to UNITY in this July's *Unitarian*. It is on "Liberty Gone Wild". The gist of it is that to claim as much liberty for the Unitarian pulpit as for the Unitarian pew is liberty gone wild. "Simply nonsense" he calls that. We can but say then that we like simple nonsense and prefer our liberty gone wild. Since among us the congregations always decide whom they want and whom they don't want in their pulpits, it is hardly worth while, even in theory, to abridge our Unitarian liberty through any fear of its becoming license. Why, even in magazine talk, drop toward the Episcopalian level, where, we believe, subscription to articles is required of the shepherd but none of the sheep? Yes, as much liberty in the pulpit as in the pew, so far as unchallenged right to the Unitarian name is concerned—which we must remind Mr. Herford is the only point in question. Otherwise it is not perfect liberty. Otherwise we mean "creed", after all. A very small creed-remnant, is it, when narrowed to the pulpit thus? But big enough to

hold the whole objectionable principle. The British tea-tax in 1770 held the whole principle of absolute government. One slave owned under the laws makes the state a slave state. One inch of "crede" makes a creed. Instead of that inch let us choose rather "liberty gone wild", and trust each other's common sense and right intent and the might of our own faith.

G.

ANOTHER illustration of mental confusion arising from lack of faith in the permanency of the religious element and the safety of the religious sentiment when guarded by honesty and justice, is found in the panic caused in certain religious circles in this city by the refusal of the principal of the West Division High School to have the graduating exercises, which were held in the Union Park Congregational church, opened by prayer. The church was selected in order to accommodate the large attendance, but the exercises belonged wholly to the public school, from which, by order of the board of education, all religious exercises have been excluded for several years. This manifestly wise and just act, springing out of a rational consideration of the equal rights of all tax-payers and of those holding varying or no religious opinions, provoked Doctor Kirtledge, in his farewell address to his large church, to hold it up as an alarming symptom of the irreligiousness of the time. And even some Unitarians, though themselves so often and so persistently ostracized from religious respectability for opinion's sake, forgetting the fact that there might have been in the graduating class, as there certainly must have been in the high school classes, the children of devout Catholics or sincere rationalists, to whom a prayer from a Presbyterian or a Baptist would give grave offense, are disposed to interpret this action of Superintendent Welles as an insult to the religious nature. To us it seems that a tender regard for the feelings and rights of the classmates who differed from them would bespeak a much more hopeful, reverent sensibility in the "sweet girl graduates" than the threat, which came from some of them, to refuse to accept their diplomas if their chosen minister were not allowed publicly to voice their thanksgiving and aspiration. O ye of little faith, seek ye first the kingdom of righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you. Reverence grows by justice. Thoughtful toleration will surely bloom into worship, and fraternity will grow its ritual. The poorest use possible to be made of prayer is to emphasize injustice and to make conscious distinctions where all should be united.

BISHOP SPALDING speaks clearly in the *Forum* against the prevalent habit by which all questions are discussed upon a money basis. There is no more dangerous constitution of mind than that which interposes finance before every attempt of the vision to examine the source of being, and the loftier souls who refuse the test and appeal to others to disregard it, may, whether they be Catholic or Protestant, Theist or Atheist, rely upon the judgment of the future to applaud the idealism.

H. L. T.

"MEETINGS for consultation over the condition of things in the west were held June 17th in Meadville, and 21st in Chicago. As the result, it was unanimously voted to take steps for the immediate organization of a Western Unitarian Association." So says the *July Unitarian*. It is too early in the day for fears or exultations yet. At the Meadville meeting, we infer from the above paper that there was present not a single minister in charge of a parish in the Western Conference, except the acting pastor of the parish. There were there President Livermore and Mr. Sunderland, the non-active pastor of the church of Ann Arbor, and doubtless he was there uninstructed by that parish. Of the eastern brethren there were present Messrs. Herford, R. R. Shippen, Tilden and Cutter. Of the Chicago meeting still less is known. It was purely a private meeting of a few gentlemen, among whom were

probably two pastors in their unrepresentative capacity. When the question of a new organization is submitted to our parishes in democratic fashion it will be time enough to measure its strength.

WHEN it is realized how near John Ruskin and William Morris have brought themselves to the sympathies of men by an order of life sweetly in consonance with humanitarian dreams, we may rightly draw a breath of relief and compose ourselves in a certainty of the future. When a cause that so needs practical as well as theoretical spokesmen finds the two persons in one, and that one a man of genius who possesses the loftiest artistic qualities, it may safely be assumed that a case has been successfully made out. The merchant princes who sneer upon the possibility of making changes in present commercial arrangements may wisely go to William Morris, in Surrey, and to the matchless Ruskin, for instruction.

H. L. T.

CHARLES W. WENDTE, upon his circular letter to the liberal friends on the Pacific slope who may need his services, prints the following splendid statements of the prophetic purpose and vision of the Unitarianism that has a soul which, like that of John Brown, still "goes marching on":

"Let us accept from Christianity its light and life and love—the pure spiritual impulse from the heart of Jesus—and leave behind all that has proved obstructive, to be forgotten with the other rubbish of the ages."—*Rev. Charles J. Ames, of Philadelphia.*

"Unitarianism is that free and progressive development of historic Christianity which aspires to be synonymous with universal ethics and universal religion."—*Rev. Samuel J. Barrows, Editor of the Christian Register, Boston.*

"Our (Unitarian) problem is not primarily intellectual but moral. It is the reconciliation of the Spirit of Truth with the Spirit of Devotion. . . . Our task is to bring together thought and reverence, the fearless mind and the uplifted heart."—*Rev. A. W. Jackson, of Santa Barbara, Cal.*

"We are not here to mould any formula of faith which shall be the password of membership, nor to shape any dogma nor declare any creed. The characteristic test of our communion is rather a method of religious thought, a tone of religious faith, than a dogma crystallized into permanent form. As the human mind is plastic, as every genuine lover of truth is always ready to receive, so we shrink from having any rigid statements of belief imposed upon us. All we ask of the Christian who seeks our communion is that his attitude be reverent and free; that he stand with uncovered head in the presence of the Almighty, but with his soul open like the flower of the field to every influence from above that may fall upon it."—*Hon. Horace Davis in Opening Address at the First Meeting of the Pacific Coast Liberal Christian Conference, 1885.*

THE *Unitarian* speaks of a Unitarianism that is "a mere passing cloud". Judging from past history, it is the heresy-hunting, the doctrinal alarm, the distrust of freedom, the attempt to make anything fundamental in the religious life other than religious living, that alone are cloud-like in their movements and their stay.

MANY of the readers of the *Independent* for July 1 must have been made happy by a three-column article from the ex-secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, because it is so full of the lugubrious representation of the past, present and future of Unitarianism, which the large constituency of that paper delights in. Whatever may have been the purpose of Mr. Sunderland in writing it, the editor of the paper has indicated the real use to which the article will be put, in his editorial entitled "An Easy Descent into Hell", in which he declares that "as a religious faith and force Unitarianism is a miserable failure", that it is now a "gaudy corpse", and that Mr. Sunderland and his associates have undertaken the "task of Sisyphus in trying to lift it up to Christian ground". These things have always been said concerning the religious life and work of Channing, Parker, Emerson and their associates. Let them be said still. Some hearts are ever ready to bear glad testimony to the falseness of the accusation. There are

souls tuned to higher faiths, touched with more generous ardor, guided to serener trusts by these "dead" truths, and by the work and word, the thought and life of those who declare that the way of holiness alone is the highway of God, and that by no possible mischance can he who travels this way miss the Father's house.

"By the light of burning heretics Christ's bleeding feet I track,
Toiling up new Calvaries ever with the cross that turns not back."

WHETHER the Unitarian movement be a "butterfly" or a "corpse", as the *Independent* calls it, there is a divine movement toward the higher unity which recognizes that all lines are man-made; that the true religion is synthetic, not analytic; that the harmony born out of uniformity is of the earth earthy, while that which springs from diversity, honest diversity, the inevitable diversity of growth, is of heaven. And toward this unity the *Independent*, Henry Ward Beecher, Professor Swing and Mr. Sunderland are making their contributions, as well as Emerson, Carlyle and the much suspected Unitarian hosts.

Is there not danger, in this attempt to avoid the dangers and annoyances that are inherent in the principles of Unitarianism and Congregationalism, that some of our churches may find themselves unconsciously slipping back into Presbyterianism, where the management of the church is not vested in the members themselves, but in a presbytery and a synod? Trustees in Unitarian churches, as in others, are generally selected on account of their business fitness or financial standing rather than on account of their spiritual gifts or religious insight; and when they presume without consultation with their people to decide such fundamental questions as the direction of missionary funds, the determining of religious fellowship, and the bounds of spiritual sympathies, the prophetic spirit of that church is seriously endangered, and the vital interest of that society in any religious or missionary cause much handicapped. We are told of three or four societies which have withdrawn their funds from the Western Conference, or taken steps to withdraw from its fellowship, and so on. We suspect that in every case this is true in a Presbyterian, and not in a Congregational, sense. In one case at least, if we are rightly informed, not only the congregation but the pastor's wishes were unconsulted before the "Board" took action. Conference fellowship is not so easily made and unmade as all this implies. The affections, associations and traditions of thirty-four years are not easily snapped by a resolution or disposed of by a board of trustees. The Western Conference fellowship is sure of permanence, because we are conscious of a great network of common sympathies and purposes binding hearts, heads and hands in every Unitarian parish in the west.

WE wish the ex-secretary of the Western Conference would tell us in some future number of the *Independent* or the *Unitarian* what the "evil effects" resulting from the position of the Western Conference, alluded to in the article in the *Independent* of July 1, are in his mind; who the one man was, to conciliate whom the Conference resolution of 1875 was passed; and whether the Sermon on the Mount is a non-Christian document because the word Christian does not appear therein; whether the Golden Rule is non-theistic because the word "God" does not appear in it; and whether we really need pine for connection with those branches of the Christian church which have always denied us the Christian name, ridiculed our position, misunderstood our inspirations,—except such connection as inevitably links truth-seekers, and except that splendid fellowship which unites all the pure in heart in the conscious presence of God.—And yet No, we do not ask him. Brethren, why waste time?

BEFORE the *Independent* gives too much sympathy to Mr. Sunderland, we commend to its reading Mr. Sunderland's best known tract, "Orthodoxy an Enemy to Christianity".

WHEN earnest people frankly admit that the facts prove a man or body of men religious, while logic proves him or them irreligious, and then deliberately prefer the conclusion of their logic rather than the testimony of facts, it shows how far we are yet from applying the simplest methods of science to questions of religion, and how slow we are to realize "that the possibilities of thought are not co-extensive or identical with the possibilities of things".

HOW TO DO IT.

One of the most venerable and trusted of our western ministers writes: "I think we have great encouragement to work earnestly the coming year. I cannot believe that we shall be crippled in our work by any withdrawal of friends or funds from the Western Conference. Men and means will more than fill the gap caused by seceders." The prophecy of this loyal brother from beyond the Missouri can readily be realized if this exigency shall only arouse us to wiser methods and more earnest financial measures. Our treasury in past years has lagged chiefly from want of business energy on the part of ministers and church officials. We have tried to do it in the easy way, and have made hard work of it. Let us make work of it and we shall find it very easy to do.

(1). First let us remember that our unorganized constituency is far greater than the organized. Upon this unorganized constituency we have a claim which we believe it will be glad to recognize. Dear reader, if you believe that the Western Conference has a work to do, if you are solicitous for its triumph, if you will rejoice in its success and mourn over its defeat, it has moneyed claims upon you just in proportion as you have been prospered. If you live in the west at a place where there is no Unitarian church, the claims upon you are more imperative than upon church members, because *you* have as yet no local claims upon you, no local opportunity of sustaining and spreading the faith you love; and because by your support our picket lines will all the sooner reach to you. Let every reader of UNITY outside of our parishes not only discharge the debt of conscience for himself, but solicit a dollar, five dollars, ten dollars, from his liberal neighbors, and send the same to our treasurer, J. B. Galloway, room 93, 175 Dearborn street. The five or twenty-five dollars sent in this way may be the beginning of the local bond of union that will bud into a Sunday circle and bloom into a Unitarian church.

(2). Let no parish this year be content with simply a collection, however carefully taken, still less with an appropriation, which the trustees, who have always a nervous eye on "arrearages", may be willing to vote, but let it be an honest *subscription* to which all recognized members of the congregation, men, women and children, shall have had a direct invitation to add their names. Find two or three men or women who will accept the solicitor's task as their piece of parish work perhaps for the year, and do it thoroughly, kindly and earnestly. It should not be the minister, except, perhaps, to get it started. It should not be the trustees or the treasurer. Lay your plans on long lines. Give ample announcement of the fact. Suppose early in September, some Sunday when the minister is announcing the plans for the season, he were to say, "During the last two weeks in October or the first week in November Miss Smith, Mrs. Brown and Mr. Jones will solicit the subscriptions of this parish for the Western Conference, our missionary right arm; and I want all the men, women and children to have their names on that list. I hope the subscriptions will run from five cents up to two hundred dollars, in proportion as God has prospered each one of you." Meanwhile let Miss Smith, Mrs. Brown and

Mr. Jones be thinking about it, acquainting themselves with the facts, the needs, the uses of the Conference, and especially getting the name and address of every one in the parish, and let all talk a little about it. Then, about the 20th of October, let the three send a postal card or a hektograph or cyclostyle letter through the post-office saying, "We are going to begin next week to take the subscriptions of the parish for the Western Conference. We hope to have the money all in by the 10th of November. We hope to have the subscription large, but are more anxious to have it general. We want something from every one of you. You will save us time and trouble if you will either send us your subscription by mail or hand it to us at church; but if this is not convenient, you may expect a call from us. Speak to the children and the wife about it, for we want their names to the cause as well as yours." Then the next Sunday after this encyclical letter has gone all around, let the minister preach his best missionary sermon, tell all about it. The chances are that it will be his great sermon of the year. Let it be the topic for the teachers' meeting that week. Let the teachers take a Sunday to talk to the children about it. They will bring their pennies, and perhaps vote a little out of their treasury. The Unity Club will give its mite as an organization, besides its individual subscriptions. The Woman's Circle will give a little. In all this work, after it is once going, Miss Smith, Mrs. Brown and Mr. Jones will have a real good time. The church will make three times the contribution to the missionary cause it has ever done before. Its self-respect will be increased, its sympathies will be broadened, the minister will preach better, and that church next year will have no difficulty in finding delegates to go to the Conference.

(3). One other practical suggestion is to be mentioned. Will this collection be made specific for the Western Conference, leaving other interests to other times and methods—or will you combine in one canvass all the missionary interests it is thought best to recognize during the year? The present writer for three years has followed the latter course, determining beforehand with his people the objects and the relative claims of each interest. Others will prefer to precipitate the main strength of their church upon one object. In still other parishes it will be best to allow each individual contributor to elect the recipient of his missionary subscription: one may prefer the Sunday-school Society, another the woman's work in the Post-office Mission, another the American Unitarian Association, some the State Conference. In all these cases the Western Conference will surely receive a generous proportion of the money which comes from our western hearts, for in the future as in the past the Conference must be the center of our western work.

Let every parish this year find their Miss Smith, Mrs. Brown and Mr. Jones and try the subscription, not the collection, plan. And let not our UNITY parishioners outside all parishes overlook the first part of this article.

HOW THEY CAPTURED THE WESTERN CONFERENCE.

A "REAL STORY" BY MR. HERFORD, MADE MORE REAL.

Our chief concern at present in our western trouble is to keep our faces fronting the main question, this namely, whether Unitarians *mean* their "no creed" principle to be the basis of their fellowship, or whether they will at last consciously and frankly make some "doctrinal basis" a necessity. The day of *unconsciousness* in this matter has gone by. But it concerns us also to correct misconceptions. And this becomes again a duty in consequence of Mr. Herford's "Real Story of Our Western Difficulty" in the July *Unitarian*, just out. He writes it to prove by history that it is "the Unity men", and specially one Gannett, who "are responsible for the whole movement. It is they who insisted on unsettling the broad platform of

1875, *chosen by their own party*, and would not rest until it was re-enacted with the word 'God' left out. It is they who have persisted at each step in trying to force their own sectional policy, and who have at last succeeded in a way which a large proportion of their fellow Unitarians feel to be so misrepresenting and injurious as to make co-operation no longer possible."

This means that the results of the western difficulty are going to be so painful that our withdrawing friends would like to make it out that the Conference is the party of secession, while *they* are the Unionists of Unitarianism. They are the Southern loyalists. Mr. Sunderland says so, too. It is but a side issue, this; and it is too early yet to know who finally will keep the old names, who win the new, if names are really to be parted. We certainly shall choose secession from Unitarianism rather than secession from the Unitarian principle. But as to the "who began it?" we tried two weeks ago, in UNITY of June 26, to answer that with fairness to both sides, somewhat as follows: East as well as west these last few years there has been a slow, half-conscious, half-unconscious movement toward larger liberty—the result of growth after the "Year Book" issue. For a time nearly all of us were in the movement. In connection with it more vigorous organization has gone forward and more missionary zeal been shown than ever before in Unitarian history. Slowly protest began to rise from a few who feared this tendency. Such protest made the movement more distinct and more conscious of itself. And then the protest grew until there came a clash.—There is the whole "real story" de-personalized, and in a nut-shell. It is the common story of a thought-growth. Our western difficulty is a precise analogue of the rise of Unitarianism at the beginning of the century. Were Channing and the liberals, who for fifty years had been gradually growing liberal, responsible for the break then—or the orthodox who at last became alarmed, and were the Douthit, Sunderland and Herford of that time? Our answer is, Both parties were responsible, and neither was to blame, save as special method was unfair or special temper violent. So now. A sad necessity had then come; an old historic Church must split. Possibly so again, although we do not think it. Time alone will show. It depends on how deeply unitarian most Unitarians are.

A side-issue,—but none the less we follow two or three of Mr. Herford's wrong impressions with corrections.

(1) All through his "real story" he assigns Mr. Gannett a place in this movement much larger than belongs to him. Were the matter merely one of blame and obloquy to those concerned in it, how cheerfully would we let him sweep the discredit into that name! and would carry blame and name out of the Unitarian camp, if that would make our trouble cease. But to help get Unitarianism into the position which the whole body will before many years loyally and gladly take, the higher spiritual position in which a religious enthusiasm may at last begin among us, and in which our ideas and faiths may be voiced to the world as never yet,—to help do this has too much *credit* in it for us to leave such mistaken thought about the leadership uncontradicted. There is one man out here who more than any other deserves credit for this vitalizing work, but Mr. Herford has never quite *seen* that man. In old western days Mr. Herford's blindness used to prompt a manner toward him that sometimes was amusing and sometimes made lookers-on indignant. But that "the Unity men" have all of them had much to do with the movement, is very true. We expect never to be ashamed of the fact. Only be it remembered that their "much" is but a little of the whole. It has been a general western movement—west-easterly—which they have marked much more than made. If this phrase, "Unity men", is to be used with any justice, it must be broadened to include many faithful ministers whose names do not appear in the editorial committee, and many earnest laymen and laywomen whose voices are but seldom heard in Conferences.

(2) It has by no means been so conscious and deliberate a movement as Mr. Herford thinks. We know the movers, especially Mr. H.'s worst one, better than Mr. H. The movement has been continuous, but by its own momentum; has become more and more distinct, but by its own logic in contact with the protest, as explained above. It could not help going forward, and it cannot help going on; for it is "the Unitarian movement" which began a hundred years and more ago on the shores of Massachusetts Bay. Step by step has been taken as light broke, and step by step will be taken, east and west, as more light breaks. Nothing has advanced it quite so far and fast of late as Mr. Sunderland and Mr. Herford with their "issue". There has been no conscious plan; no saying, Next year we will manage to get what this year we failed to get; no shaping things to far-off ends; no unresting till an end was reached; no rallying of the clans to Conferences; nothing secret. The only secrets have been those kept from us: the only surprises, we think, those we have felt. Not that these things would necessarily have been sin,—only they were not fact, and are not the ways and methods natural to "Unity men". To be sure, we have, if not the gift, the liability to prophecy! and when we know good things that are to be, are apt to break the silence badly. But this is only to be cranks, not plotters and campaigners.

(3) And nothing more illustrates the indeliberateness of this movement (on our side) than the last Cincinnati Conference, which Mr. Herford describes as the deliberate and violent consummation of the whole thing in a "capture of the Western Conference"! Once more then we tell that story. "The Christian Register", he says, "persists in representing the 'business basis' [which the Conference adopted at its incorporation in 1882] as a sort of original solid ground, which Mr. Sunderland is charged with disturbing." The *Christian Register* is right. That was a sort of solid ground; one not to our liking any more than Mr. Herford's; but, so far as we know hearts and minds, no one had thought of seeking other working basis for the Conference, until Mr. Sunderland last year at St. Louis announced that Unitarian salvation depended on a change,—on somehow getting a "doctrinal basis" underneath us. That was a surprise to all, even to those who knew of his three years' steady push for the same thing in the Michigan State Conference. As soon as he got home he proceeded to publish in *UNITY*, for four weeks running, some forms of doctrinal basis which he recommended for general adoption,—doing this officially as Western Conference Secretary! Which surprised us again very much,—being old-fashioned Unitarians. We remember telling him then that, if he pushed this issue as he had begun, it would inevitably bring on a discussion reaching to more central, agitating questions than any of our previous Unitarian debates. But this last year the Secretary got ready, Mr. Herford helping, to push it much more widely. Sure as he went east, letters would come from there to some of us, "What is the matter with your western Unitarianism?" *UNITY* said little,—said so little that it incurred the charge of favoring a hush-policy. But it waited with a growing ache at heart, forefeeling what might come. Last January saw the *Unitarian* established,—the cause had made its organ. Four of its editors, including Mr. Herford, were now in line with Mr. Douthit, virtually asking in chorus, Is it honest for Unitarian ministers as such to be devoid of certain doctrines? Five arms were outstretched pointing such men to the door,— "Don't you know where you belong?" The "Unity men" were not themselves involved in the desired procession to the door, but in the name of all Unitarians they thought it time at last to stand up and answer the question. And they did so. They have not yet found time to sit down and stop answering. And then, it is true, a sort of "campaign" feeling began to wake in them. They knew the records and the temperament of the men they faced, and felt drearily sure it was no holiday muster-field to which they went.

As Conference time came around again, the Directors

twice or thrice considered whether it would not be well to squarely face the "issue" by giving it a set niche in the programme. The general wish was strong to avoid it; an equally strong feeling was that it would be very apt in some way to come up,—if nowhere else, at the election of the Secretary. Mr. Sunderland's repeated word, as we understood him, was, "If it comes up for debate, you will have to bring it up." The "Conference sermon" by usage fell this year to the substitute-preacher of the previous year: he broke the usage, because for him to speak his heart-word would have brought the issue up. Suddenly, upon the eve of the Conference, Mr. Sunderland's misleading pamphlet appeared and was mailed from the Secretary's office in large quantities east and west. *It was a wedge deliberately set in all the churches:* and now the Conference would either be frightened by it on to a "doctrinal basis", or be put in a very equivocal light with all good Christians if it hesitated or refused to go there. Did Mr. Sunderland's adviser have anything to do with the timing of that pamphlet? And still "the Unity men" had no plan for Cincinnati action, except that the very last of them now felt that Mr. S. had forfeited all claims for re-election, and a man had been asked if he would take the nomination were it offered him. On the cars going down to Cincinnati Mr. Effinger was asked the same question,—the very first word said to him.

At Cincinnati, in the Directors' preliminary meeting on Tuesday morning, Mr. Sunderland read his report to them. It revealed a strong long section pushing again for the "doctrinal basis". Again surprise. The pamphlet and the report,—that was Mr. Sunderland's way of not bringing up the issue for debate. Then, and not till then, the "issue" was accepted by the men whom Mr. Herford thinks forced it on the meeting; and that afternoon the debate began. It was of no use to trifle longer with, to hope longer from, a man whose conscience made such demands on him as Mr. Sunderland's. And even then "the Unity men" had no resolutions in hand. Things simply went on developing, step by step. At the afternoon meeting a friend had read some statements which he thought of presenting the next day as resolutions. That night at the hotel he asked to talk them over, and I urged him to simplify them. The next morning waking early with the matter still in mind, I presently took pencil and jotted down a simple form—my main thought, as I wrote it, being to compare it with my friend's, but the thought of a possible further use soon came. It was shown to him, and to two or three besides, and was in pocket when the debate began again. After Mr. Sunderland had introduced approvingly two resolutions which Judge McCrary had sent on—the first resolutions read—and after Mr. Clute had formally offered one of these, and two or three speakers had spoken on it,—then, and not till then, did I bring forward mine, which proposed two things: (1) An outright ethical basis of fellowship; and (2) a committee to submit next year to the Conference some simple declarations of "the things most commonly believed to-day among us, the statement being always open to re-statement and to be regarded only as the thought of the majority". And as the bearing of Mr. Sunderland's "doctrinal basis" was by this time pretty clearly understood, spite of his disclaimers of "no creed"; and as, of the various resolutions offered, my first one was the only one which said a square No to Mr. Sunderland's long pressed demand; and as it was the only thing which *could* give a No to it, because the strongest "no creed" resolution left that demand to his mind all untouched,—for these reasons the majority of the Conference held to it across all substitutes and all attempts to table, until it was adopted.—This was the way "the Unity men" "forced their own sectional policy" and "captured the Western Conference".

To sum up,—though Mr. Herford does not a whit mistake *UNITY*'s general emphases and tendencies, yet had not Mr. Sunderland attempted at St. Louis to change the 1882 "business basis" of the Conference to a "doctrinal

basis", we believe that business basis would still be to-day the unrevised, unsupplemented, unquestioned basis of the Conference. We do not say that an ethical basis of fellowship would never have been proposed, for we believe *all* Unitarians will by and by choose that stand as the only basis adequate to the most spiritual and most forceful meanings of "religion" and "Christianity;" but to no one, that we know, had the thought come of proposing it.

And further, had not Mr. Sunderland this year broadcast that misrepresenting pamphlet and re-urged his "doctrinal basis" in his report, we believe—not with equal, yet with large, assurance—that the "issue" would have been avoided at Cincinnati also, and that we would have come home as we went, with simply a new Secretary.

Further yet,—wisely or unwisely, our second resolution, alluded to above, looked forward to providing next year that very declaration of beliefs which Mr. Sunderland and Mr. Herford insist is so essential to the Unitarian missionary's success,—looked forward to securing this in open connection with the ethical basis of fellowship, and in a way equitable to dissenters and freed from usual credal dangers. This resolution was defeated *by the help of Mr. Sunderland and his friends*, who voted against it on the ground "that the Conference as a Conference has nothing to do with personal opinions and beliefs!" *They!* whose sole aim and single purpose in this "issue" has been to plant the Conference as a solid whole upon a "doctrinal basis", and one to be understood as "necessary", although, as they said,—and it passed our understanding what they meant—"no creed".

Mr. Herford's "real story", to be *real* real, must make room for the above revision. All these details must not put out of any reader's mind the fact that the question before the Conference was *not*, what doctrines do we Unitarians believe? but, will we *limit our Unitarian fellowship* by *any* doctrines, however great and dear? The "We believe" of Unitarianism are all exactly as they were before the Cincinnati Conference, and no one knows that better than these friends of ours. It is the "*You must believe it too*", which we abandon,—abandon explicitly because a tremendous effort has been made to make us say it implicitly. The men who made that effort are honest. But *we* could not have yielded to it quietly and been honest. There was the trouble. And now that these men are going to draw apart to press their issue farther, we can do no otherwise than turn to all whom they would fain draw after them, and ask respectfully, but earnestly, the conscience-question which we had to answer for ourselves: To *you*, trying to judge aright in this our western difficulty, is that 1875 resolution, for changing which Mr. Herford so rebukes us, *honest*? The resolution reads, "The Western Unitarian Conference conditions its fellowship on no dogmatic tests, but welcomes all thereto who desire to work with it in advancing the kingdom of God." "Dogmatic" is but another adjective for "doctrinal", and why is one rebuked for calling the belief in "God" a dogma or a doctrine? Because the greatest of all doctrines, is it therefore not a doctrine? And does "religion" really begin with the name of God and cease with it,—as much of this rebuking hints? Is religious conviction, religious feeling, religious enthusiasm, really confined to those alone who word their greatest faith as faith in "God"? Much current talk goes on that shallow notion, but are we Unitarians to skim the shallows of religion in our talk of it? For ourselves that resolution, which was unconscious in its inconsistency when made, has to-day grown conscious, and is no longer honest on our lips. Which clause of it do we *mean*,—the first one, or the last? It reads somewhat as the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution would read, if it ran, "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude, and the United States counts as its citizens all white men who have never been in slavery." And again, would it be honest in *you* (we say that we believe it is in *them*, al-

though we fail to comprehend the mental attitude which makes it honest) to talk of "No creeds meant", and yet to insist on certain doctrines as the "necessary beliefs" of a Unitarian, losing which he loses full right to the name? Conscience-questions, these. Let one's answer to them, be it earnest Yes or earnest No, involve no charge against a differing brother. But they are as doors into our main question,—we repeat it here: Is it not time for Unitarians to *mean* their "no-creed" principle *full-length*, in all its consequences to religion? Be it our duty, friends, to make those consequences glorious! Then before long our brethren will see too. And, as years go on, the neighbor Churches, now criticising and predicting shame, will be leavened anew by our high faith,—as sixty years ago. Is there no vision in *our* day? W. C. G.

Contributed Articles.

TO MEMORY.

Come, wonder-worker! Surest welcome thine,
For thou wilt lead me in the ways I love—
E'en through long silent years, to the glad times
And budding regions of a cloudless youth.
A radiance of the rose floods all my sight;
An atmosphere of cordial bears me on
To view thy mellow pictures of the past,
Thy still presentments of a life dissolved.
I breathe about me everywhere the breath
And benediction of pale, speechless lips—
I hear the murmur of guardian-angel wings—
I know the spirit echoes of a voice
That lives forever in my love, and sings
In mortal language an immortal song!
With thee I stroll adown the pleasant vales,
Or climb again the sun-bathed mountain height
Of one idyllic dream; again I walk
Beside the grass-grown brooklet where it laves
The flowery meadow-lands. Thus as of yore
I wander, and with hallowed thoughts inhale
The cherished fragrance of affections dead.
My hand in thine, I pass with solemn step
Along the old familiar lanes, where banks
Of living green, brown paths and skies of blue
Are blended with the art that nature hath,
Into a pure, symphonious, perfect sight,
All-satisfying to this heart of mine,—
This simple heart of mine that oft-times felt,
In such a scene, as one allowed to stand
Before some shrine, with eyes of reverent love,
To drink the holy influence and to kiss
The hem of God's eternal robe of beauty.

EDWARD LIPPITT FALES.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

A POPULAR FALLACY.

The modern church has awakened at last to the importance of genuine independence. For ages it has appealed to civil mercy, party favor or national prejudice, and in consequence of this some of its most valuable interests have been jeopardized. There is an independence which is dependence, and it matters not how broad a church polity may be or how far-reaching the theology of the pulpit; if that institution fawns after the state or public, it manifests a weakness too apparent to be overlooked. A gentleman said to me recently that he received his first lessons under the great Theodore Parker, and in those palmy days, although Mr. Parker was branded as a heretic, an atheist and an extremist, even by his own church, the line of demarcation was so closely drawn by the ministry between the good and bad that we could by an instinctive difference tell "a sheep from a goat", "a Plebeian from a Patrician", "a man of God from a man of the world". But

now it is impossible to tell who is a church member unless you possess a list. We would not return to the days when the Puritans were godly so long as they had no one to interfere with their methods of work or belief, or to the days when a man was characterized as a Christian by a peculiar dress, yet the fact is nevertheless true that our broad and liberal pulpit, although it calls every one a child of God—although it removes caste and *éclat* and prejudice from men, is too ready to fold its arms about the man of the world, hug the millionaire, however vile, and court authority, under the name of Christ, however depraved and mercenary. I recall an illustration of this very fact. A minister was about to settle in a flourishing church in a Pennsylvania city, and who can imagine his surprise when, before he entered the pulpit, he was informed that no man, however liberal, be he a Unitarian or a Universalist, could afford to talk "Temperance" in this church. He learned upon inquiry that three-tenths of the members were engaged in the liquor traffic, either the manufacture or sale of it, and that the paying constituent was of this unworthy class. He sought a more congenial place, and found it next to impossible to be a Christian and yet refuse or be openly ordered not to talk on so revolutionary and great a question. I hold, and strongly, that the time has come when the pulpit will not yield to the pew, and that protection is one thing and humanity and God quite another. It has always appeared to me that men could not worship God and Mammon, or, in other words, be true Christians and yet carry on a work which, admitted by the consensus of the world and the best scientific authority, is undermining the very foundation of our commonwealth and institutions. If the church must bow the knee to wealth and pander to prestige, it will soon be ridiculed as it ought by the very men who carry on "the contemptible work"; but if it sustains a pure character and upholds its primitive virtues, however the vulgar clamor "Great is Diana of the Ephesians", it will lift the world nearer God and hasten the coming of a brighter, purer and larger civilization. Can our liberal churches afford to overlook so urgent a need, or be the last to "go down to darkness, death and nonentity", if we must do so to be true to the essential demands of morality? Let us preach fearlessly the religion, beautiful and true, we so openly profess.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.

J. C. F. GRUMBINE.

THE LIFE OF MY SOUL:

CHAPTER III.*

Soon after what the church called conversion I felt it my duty to give my life to urging men to better living. This is called a call to preach. And here was a rub. The simplicity of my early religious life soon departed. For now came in the doctrines, now I learned more definitely how the blood of Jesus saved me, how I had escaped eternal punishment, how wonderful was the scheme of salvation, how, very possibly, I was saved only by being one of the elect. My religion came to me, or rather reached a certain degree of life in me, before my theology had put forth its great leaves. Of course I felt it my duty to accept the theology of the church of which I was a member. That church had helped me in my religious life, surely its theology was true. I put on the theology as I put on a garment; it had not its roots in my life—its life was not nourished by my life. It was a matter of intellect—perhaps of will. I willed to believe such and such, and in no small degree succeeded. I am right here, for well I remember I had determined to believe certain things and not believe certain other things. I would not be a Calvinist on the subject of election. That was a garment so ill-fitting that I would not put it on. This was my determination no matter what inspired record taught. Of course I would not acknowledge this to myself then; but I read only the one side of the question—namely the Arminian. These strange chapters of Paul's in Romans, the 7th and 8th, must square with Arminianism no matter what

twisting and wrenching was done. How sad! What a poor exchange this for the early simplicity of religion! And yet it was the beginning of a religious life from the side of reason. It was long before the early sentiment and this later religion from reason's side blended, giving me a theology vitally related to and growing out of the sentiment of religion. God, Jesus, the Bible, heaven and hell were things in theology—that is, my ideas of them were so for the most part. They were not present to my thought as living principles, actuating forces in me, however much, unknown to me, they really were a part of my life. The Bible was the word of God, its very word was from Him, but it was spiritless. It had light but no warmth. Jesus was good to die for me, but he was sent for that purpose—He was God and could well bear the awful burden. He was my mediator with God, but no brother. He revealed the mysteries of heaven—which mysteries always puzzled me. Certainly the life in me was deepening through experience, through a determination to do right and a longing to draw into my being the infinite resources of God. But there was no fellowship between thought and sentiment, my theology and my life. The old forgetfulness of self was gone, and in its place was a theological knowledge of my own salvation and the damnation of most others. When fitted by training to respond to the call, I preached this theology. But beneath all was my life, in which were hid the living forces which made the worlds in all their beauty, and this life was struggling into the fuller life.

A. W.

The Study Table.

Solar Heat, Gravitation and Sun Spots. By J. H. Kedzie. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1886. 304 pages. \$1.50.

In this book the author argues that the three phenomena mentioned in the title are all alike to be explained by vibrations in the universal ether. This ether absorbs the heat given out by the sun and stars, conserves it and converts it into various forms of energy. To our sun the ether gives back this energy in the form of heat, the solar supply of which is hence little if at all diminishing. The ether waves beat upon all worlds from all directions; but when two globes shield each other the waves beat hardest on the outer sides, and hence tend to draw the two together in what we call gravitation. The planets protecting the equatorial regions of our sun from the same ether waves hence cool it and produce sun spots, which therefore have a period seeming to be connected with the perihelion of the great Jupiter.

The author argues his theory with considerable learning. Still he is not very convincing. One naturally asks why these universal ether waves should produce so intense heat on the surface of the sun and none at all on the earth, but leave the latter to grow ever colder through the night; and the author's answer to this question is very unsatisfactory. So his attempt to explain gravitation, though not so very different from Le Sage's, is no more convincing. Taking into account the immense distance between the sun and Jupiter, they would not protect each other from the ether waves any more than Long Island and St. Helena protect each other from the waves of the Atlantic. The book will have to be classed as rather imaginative. Nor is its language exact enough for a scientific work. The preface, for instance, tells us that "probably not one work has been written on the sun to one million of fiction";—yet the largest library in this country contains less than half a million works altogether, and many on the sun. Again the book tells us that "the starry concave is studded with millions of millions, yea, billions of billions of suns";—yet the most powerful telescopes show only 75 million at the highest estimate, and Prof. Newcomb says from 30 to 50 millions. The author is ingenious and the book quite suggestive in its speculations, but must be read with care.

H. M. S.

* See UNITY, volume XVI., page 237.

UNITY

AND THE UNIVERSITY.

Editors, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, David Utter, James Villa Blake, William C. Gannett, John C. Learned, Henry M. Simmons, Frederick L. Hosmer; Special Editorial Contributors, John R. Effinger, Charles Douglas, Judson Fisher, Edwin E. Champlin, Horace L. Traubel, Celia P. Woolley, Emma Endicott Mearns, Ellen T. Leonard, and others; Office Editor, Charles H. Kerr. The editors assume no responsibility for the opinions expressed by correspondents. Communications must be marked with the real name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

* * * The subscription price of UNITY is \$1.50 per annum, payable in advance. Single copies 5 cents. The date on the address label indicates the time to which the subscription is paid. Remittances are acknowledged by changing this date. No written receipts are sent unless requested. Subscribers are requested to note the expiration of their subscriptions and send in their renewals without waiting for bills. No paper discontinued without an explicit order and payment of all arrearages. Remit by draft on Chicago or New York, or by postal or express order, payable to CHARLES H. KERR & CO., 175 Dearborn street, Chicago.

* * * With an increasing circulation among the most desirable class of readers, UNITY AND THE UNIVERSITY offers an excellent medium for remunerative advertising. Only a limited space is allowed for advertisements, and no objectionable advertisements are taken at any price. Cuts and heavy display will be admitted only on the second and the two last pages, not on the front page or in the body of the paper. Rate per line, agate measure, 10 cents, reading notices 20 cents per agate line for space occupied. Advertisers outside Chicago can make contracts by applying to Edwin Alden & Bro., Fifth and Vine streets, Cincinnati, or 140 Nassau street, New York city.

Notes from the Field.

Boston Notes.—Brother Dall writes from the Himalayas: "Let me thank you for the copy of UNITY with a notice of my work. Unitarians are hearing the call of God to help young India. We ought to have twenty missionaries here. The Methodists have sixty. Our hearers understand English and prefer it to their own language in sermons. I always preach and lecture in English, though in the homes I use the native tongue. Other foreign missionaries preach in an imperfect language of the audience and do not so much lift up the natives. We ought to have a minister-at-large here to work with native assistants. Native teachers help me among my nearly ten thousand pupils, using my moral and religious manuals. There are here two hundred and fifty awakening souls to enlighten. God speed my earnest appeals. Twenty-five dollars a year will sustain a good school, of which several could be made useful right now."

—Harvard College has resolved not to permit on its grounds the game of football, because it has grown to be "dangerous and cruel".

—The Hemenway Gymnasium, of Harvard, is classed in the U. S. report as the best in the United States in regard to building and equipment and system of instruction. The gymnasium of the Boston Young Men's Christian Union is named as the best exercise annex of such associations in the United States.

Chicago.—The national service held at the Third Unitarian church proved a real season of religious as well as patriotic quickening, if indeed we are not making a distinction where there is scarcely a difference, for love of country is love of good and love of good is love of God. The audience was large, the singing spirited, the orchestral accompaniment fitting, and the speaking programme announced in our last was carried out to its full length. Mr. Blake is off with his family for the vacation weeks at Twin Lakes, Wis. Mr. Milsted keeps open doors until the first of August, after which he is off for Alaska, via California. The pastor of All Souls, who finds the cares of the new building not lessening as it approaches completion, will be held to his duties and anxieties here and hereabouts for most of the season.

Buffalo, N. Y.—We are sorry that the following note of an interesting meeting was pocketed unwittingly on its way through the

editorial drawer, but our readers will be interested in it though belated. A few more ministerial conferences of this kind might save ministers once in a while from public blunders.

The May Ministerial Conference met at Buffalo, June 9-11. There were present from abroad Revs. Calthrop, Silsbee, Whitcomb, Somers, Adams, of Dunkirk, Hosmer, of Cleveland; and Rev. John McDowell, of Manchester, England, tarried with the company a day on his way to Detroit, where he was to preach the following Sunday. A public service was held in the Church of Our Father on the evening of June 10, at which there were several short addresses. A very enjoyable reception was given at its close by the Buffalo friends in their church parlors. The other meetings of the Conference were held at Dr. Cutter's house. Mr. Calthrop gave, by request, his paper upon God, recently given in Boston at the ministers' meeting there. Dr. Cutter read a paper upon spiritualism, others present contributed a sermon or essay to the informal programme; and the matter of each paper was followed by conversation upon the same. Two days were profitably passed in this fellowship of thought and feeling. Mr. Mann, of Rochester, was kept at home by illness. Ithaca and Meadville were not represented.

The New Order of Knighthood.—With the advance of civilization our ideals of chivalry are steadily lifting. To be loyal to conscience, to protect the weak, to be ever ready for the redress of wrong means far more to-day than it did in the days of good King Arthur. The demand for the brave and true of heart was never so great as now. One needs but to glance over our great dallies or walk through our city streets or drop into any assemblage where men congregate or glance at the fearful statistics that tell us of the strength of that great maelstrom of social impurity, that year by year draws in its thousands and scores of thousands of weak and ignorant victims to cry out for an order of spotless knights, each individual of which shall have

"the strength of ten",
Because his heart is pure.

The eddying currents of this maelstrom penetrate to every quiet village and country cross roads, and from its fatal power not even our little girls are safe. Evidently we must inaugurate a new crusade if we would preserve the manhood of our sons or the womanhood of our daughters. The seeds of moral contamination are floating everywhere. We need to fasten the white flower of purity on every youthful breast, and sedulously fan the inborn spark of chivalry that exists somewhere in the breast of every man, even the most unassuming and degraded. They are perishing for lack of a high ideal. And we have it in the lofty vow of *The Knights of the White Cross*. We need a great army of these knights, and we shall have it. Already the movement is most auspiciously started in England and in this country. Every man who desires to join this sacred crusade to *redeem and preserve manhood, and protect womanhood* is made Sir Knight by virtue of this solemn vow:

- I Promise By The Help Of God, . . .
1. To treat all women with respect and endeavor to protect them from wrong and degradation.
2. To endeavor to put down all indecent language and coarse jests.
3. To maintain the law of purity as equally binding upon men and women.
4. To endeavor to spread these principles among my companions, and to try and help my younger brothers.
5. To use every possible means to fulfill the command—"Keep Thyself Pure".

We need a special "Round Table" in every town and village and hamlet in the land. How many are ready to set up this new "Standard of the Cross" in their own immediate neighborhood? Personal leadership is

the one thing needed. Let those whom God has specially anointed for this work respond to this call.
C. T. C.

Not Alms, but a Friend, is the suggestive motto which the Charity Organization Society of Chicago places at the head of a handbill announcing the organization of a Provident Coal Club, the object of which is to encourage poor people to save money in summer to meet the winter cold with. Ten cents constitutes a membership fee. Thirty payments entitle the purchaser to one ton of best Wilmington coal. Not more than five tons will be contracted for to any one person. This secures lowest wholesale rates to those who most need them, and is one of the many good things which we may expect to spring from the fertile mind of W. Alexander Johnson, the new secretary of the organization. Mr. Johnson organized a similar club in Cincinnati last year with great satisfaction. This is a helpful word to pass around.

A Famous School.—The annual catalogue of the West Newton (West Newton, Mass.) English and Classical School is before us. Among its pupils we see names from Texas, Tennessee, Illinois, Iowa, Porto Rico, Cuba, as well as from Massachusetts and the farther East. Among the parents and guardians of children who have been pupils at this school, appear the well-known names of Horace Mann, Doctor Howe, Theodore Parker, Samuel J. May, and Dr. E. L. Holmes, of Chicago. The fact that the pedagogic name of Allen appears at the head of the board of instruction, and frequently reappears in the faculty, is sufficient guarantee that the school is still up to its mark.

The Education of Women.—Rev. Herrick Johnson gave the dedication address of the Albert Lea College, a Presbyterian school for women just forming at this place, the sale of which in pamphlet form helps "furnish our rooms". We congratulate the girls of Minnesota and the Northwest on this one more chance for an education, but we advise none of them to avail themselves of the privileges of this school until they have failed to find the open way into such schools as will admit their brothers also. The best there is for the boys is none too good for the girls. For particulars address Miss L. Watson, Albert Lea, Minn.

Our English Visitor.—We regret that Rev. John McDowell, who represented the British and Foreign Unitarian Association at the recent Boston anniversaries, was obliged to make Detroit the limit of his western tour. We had a warm welcome waiting for him in Chicago. But want of time alone kept him from the more extended tour. We are glad to hear that Mr. McDowell's interest in America steadily grew from Boston to Detroit. He was able to put in a day with Mr. Hosmer in Cleveland, returning thence to New England in the expectation of sailing for home June 23.

San Francisco.—The *Catholic Monitor*, of this city, recently accused Brother Wendte, the missionary of the American Unitarian Association, of a "ruffianly attack on the Mother of God." The missionary, notwithstanding the attack, is going his rounds these weeks among the scattered brethren in Oregon and Washington Territory. Rev. C. P. Massey, of the Congregational church, is supplying the pulpit of Doctor Stebbins during his absence in the east.

The American Israelite of this city displayed rare editorial self-control when it said: "We have said nothing concerning the Doctor Sonneschein controversy in St. Louis, because we know nothing about it", and added: "We have no cause to believe anything against the integrity and manhood of Doctor Sonneschein as a Jew and a gentleman."